

The Honorable Richard A. Jones

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON AT SEATTLE

T-MOBILE USA, INC., a Delaware  
corporation,

Plaintiff,

v.

HUAWEI DEVICE USA, INC., a Texas  
corporation; and HUAWEI TECHNOLOGIES  
CO. LTD., a China company,

Defendants.

NO. C14-1351 RAJ

DEFENDANTS HUAWEI DEVICE  
USA, INC. AND HUAWEI  
TECHNOLOGIES CO., LTD.'S  
MOTION TO COMPEL

NOTE ON MOTION CALENDAR:  
June 3, 2016

DEFENDANT HUAWEI DEVICE USA, INC.  
AND HUAWEI TECHNOLOGIES CO., LTD.'S  
MOTION TO COMPEL  
No. C14-1351 RAJ

**GORDON TILDEN THOMAS & CORDELL LLP**  
1001 Fourth Avenue, Suite 4000  
Seattle, WA 98154  
Phone (206) 467-6477  
Fax (206) 467-6292

1 Defendants Huawei Device USA, Inc. (“Huawei USA”) and Huawei Technologies Co.,  
2  
3 Ltd. (“Huawei Technologies” and, collectively, “Huawei”), by and through undersigned counsel,  
4  
5 hereby move, pursuant to Rules 26 and 37 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, for an order  
6  
7 compelling T-Mobile USA, Inc. (“T-Mobile”) (a) to designate witnesses on 30(b)(6) Topic Nos.  
8  
9 21, 22, 25, and 30, (b) to provide a substantive response to Interrogatory Nos. 9-11, (c) to  
10  
11 supplement responses to Interrogatory Nos. 1-8, and (d) to produce documents responsive to  
12  
13 Request for Production Nos. 1, 3, 15, 82, 83, 89, 92, and 93.  
14

15 Since the beginning of this case, Huawei has sought discovery from T-Mobile to  
16  
17 ascertain the scope of T-Mobile’s allegations and to prepare its defense. All along the way, as is  
18  
19 seen from the motions practice in the case, T-Mobile has delayed and obfuscated. Now, in the  
20  
21 final days of fact discovery, it appears that T-Mobile’s strategy of “playing out the clock” may  
22  
23 succeed unless the Court intervenes. T-Mobile has failed to provide a variety of documents and  
24  
25 information that is highly relevant, directly tied to the claims or defenses in the case, and which  
26  
27 have been promised or are the subject of the Court’s prior Orders.  
28

29 **I. LOCAL RULE 37(a) CERTIFICATION**  
30

31 Huawei’s counsel certifies that they have conferred in good faith with counsel for T-  
32  
33 Mobile in an effort to resolve the instant dispute without Court intervention. The parties held a  
34  
35 telephonic meet and confer on May 4, 2016. Declaration of Margaret P. Kammerud  
36  
37 (“Kammerud Decl.”) ¶ 2. During the meet and confer process, T-Mobile made several  
38  
39 representations that remain unfulfilled today, three business days prior to the close of fact  
40  
41 discovery. *Id.* Specifically, T-Mobile acknowledged that it had committed to designate a  
42  
43 witness on 30(b)(6) Topic No. 22, even though it had not yet (and still has not) designated a  
44  
45

1 witness on the Topic, and T-Mobile committed to provide Huawei its final position on  
2  
3 outstanding discovery, including the designation of a witness on Topic Nos. 21 and 25. *Id.* T-  
4  
5 Mobile also agreed to respond to Huawei's Second Set of Interrogatories, responses which were  
6  
7 due on April 28, but T-Mobile has not served substantive responses. *Id.* Moreover, T-Mobile  
8  
9 backed away from its earlier representations that it would supplement its responses to  
10  
11 Interrogatory Nos. 1-8, claiming that supplementation was no longer required because  
12  
13 depositions were underway. *Id.* T-Mobile also categorically refused to designate a witness on  
14  
15 Rule 30(b)(6) Topic No. 30 and would not commit to produce requested documents responsive  
16  
17 to Request for Production Nos. 1, 3, 15, 17, 82, 83, 89, 92, and 93. *Id.* Because of these  
18  
19 positions, the parties have reached an impasse.

## 21 **II. ARGUMENT**

### 23 **A. T-Mobile Must Produce a 30(b)(6) Witness on Topic Nos. 21, 22, 25 and 30**

25 **Topic No. 22.** Huawei Topic No. 22 requests a corporate witness to testify on T-  
26  
27 Mobile's assessment of Huawei as a handset manufacturer and supplier, including, without  
28  
29 limitation, performance of Huawei handsets. On April 8, 2016, T-Mobile responded with  
30  
31 generic objections and then stated: "T-Mobile will designate one or more individuals to testify  
32  
33 on T-Mobile's behalf regarding this topic." Kammerud Decl., Ex. 1. During the meet and  
34  
35 confer on May 4, counsel for T-Mobile confirmed that T-Mobile intended to designate a witness  
36  
37 on this topic. It is now nine days later, there are only three business days remaining in fact  
38  
39 discovery, and T-Mobile has yet to designate a witness on the subject. Huawei respectfully  
40  
41 requests that the Court compel T-Mobile to designate a witness on the subject and permit  
42  
43 Huawei to take the deposition after the close of fact discovery.  
44  
45

1           **Topic Nos. 21 and 25.** In its responses to Huawei's 30(b)(6) Topic Nos. 21 and 25,<sup>1</sup> T-  
2  
3 Mobile stated that it would "consider providing a witness after a meet and confer." *Id.* T-  
4  
5 Mobile never disputed the relevance of the subjects, which pertain to the contracts underlying T-  
6  
7 Mobile's claim for breach of contract and T-Mobile's assessment of its suppliers' handsets; T-  
8  
9 Mobile requested clarification of the scope of the topics, which Huawei provided during the May  
10  
11 4 meet and confer. Despite having indicated that the topics were reasonable and promising to  
12  
13 provide Huawei with T-Mobile's revised position, T-Mobile has yet to designate witnesses on  
14  
15 the topics. Time has run out, and Huawei must now ask the Court to compel T-Mobile to  
16  
17 designate a witness on Topic Nos. 21 and 25 and permit Huawei to take the deposition after the  
18  
19 close of fact discovery.  
20

21           **Topic No. 30.** T-Mobile has refused to designate a witness to testify on Topic No. 30,  
22  
23 which seeks communications with third parties, including but not limited to OptoFidelity and  
24  
25 Deutsche Telekom AG, related to this Action or any of the underlying actions. *Id.* This is an  
26  
27 attempt by T-Mobile to use discovery as a sword and a shield: T-Mobile propounded the  
28  
29 reciprocal topic on Huawei,<sup>2</sup> and Huawei designated a witness on the subject who T-Mobile has  
30  
31  
32  
33

---

34  
35 <sup>1</sup> Topic No. 21: The Master Supply Agreement, the Non-Disclosure Agreement, the Clean  
36 Room Letter, and any other agreement under which T-Mobile is making a breach of contract  
37 claim.

38 Topic No. 25: Performance of handsets and other devices of all OEMs that supply such devices  
39 to T-Mobile.  
40

41 <sup>2</sup> T-Mobile Topic No. 34: "Huawei's communications with third parties and/or [its co-  
42 defendant] (but excluding Huawei's own counsel retained for this matter) about this lawsuit or  
43 about T-Mobile's allegations of theft of information related to its testing robot." Kammerud  
44 Decl. Exs. 2 & 3; *cf. id.* Ex. 4 at Topic No. 30.  
45

1 now deposited. Huawei asks the Court to compel T-Mobile to produce a witness on Topic No. 30  
2  
3 and permit Huawei to take the deposition after the close of fact discovery.  
4

5 **B. T-Mobile Must Respond to Interrogatories**  
6

7 **Interrogatory Nos. 9-11.** Huawei served T-Mobile with its Second Set of  
8  
9 Interrogatories, Interrogatory Nos. 9-11, on March 24, 2016. Despite having previously  
10  
11 responding to only eight interrogatories, T-Mobile categorically refused to answer the new  
12  
13 Interrogatories on the asserted basis that the requests were “compound and an improper  
14  
15 circumvention of the 25 Interrogatory limit.” *Id.*, Ex. 5 at 6. During the May 4 meet and confer,  
16  
17 T-Mobile did not dispute the relevant of the interrogatories and acknowledged that it had not  
18  
19 responded to the 25 interrogatory limit imposed by the Federal Rules. T-Mobile said that it  
20  
21 would respond to some portions of Huawei’s Second Set of Interrogatories.<sup>3</sup> *Id.* ¶ 2. T-Mobile’s  
22  
23 substantive responses, however, were due on April 28. Now, more than two weeks after those  
24  
25 responses were due and nine days since the meet and confer, T-Mobile has yet to provide a  
26  
27 substantive response to Huawei’s Second Set of Interrogatories. Huawei respectfully requests  
28  
29 that the Court compel T-Mobile to respond immediately.  
30

31 **Interrogatory Nos. 1-8.** In the Court’s recent Order, Dkt. No. 129, the Court ruled:  
32  
33 “Because T-Mobile has repeatedly stated that it will supplement its interrogatories the Court  
34  
35 finds no basis for compelling T-Mobile to respond . . .” Dkt. 129 at 10. T-Mobile should have  
36  
37 supplemented its interrogatories by this late date in the fact discovery period, but it has not. For  
38  
39 example, T-Mobile has yet to produce a complete list of modifications to its robot that T-Mobile  
40

---

41  
42 <sup>3</sup> T-Mobile maintains that certain of Huawei’s interrogatories are compound, but agreed that  
43 even under its interpretation of the number of interrogatories, T-Mobile has not yet responded to  
44 25 and, thus, owes Huawei additional responses. Kammerud Decl. ¶ 2. Huawei disagrees with  
45 T-Mobile’s assertion that it has propounded more than 25 interrogatories.

1 is claiming as a trade secret, including a description of each modification, in response to  
2  
3 Interrogatory No. 2. Now that T-Mobile's experts have submitted their reports, it should be easy  
4  
5 for T-Mobile to supplement its interrogatory responses to include more than general objections  
6  
7 and ambiguous statements.  
8

9         At this time, Huawei renews its request for the Court to compel T-Mobile to supplement  
10  
11 its responses due T-Mobile's new position on the issue of supplementation. Specifically, during  
12  
13 the meet and confer call, counsel for T-Mobile indicated that they do not intend to supplement  
14  
15 Interrogatory Nos. 1-8 despite T-Mobile's earlier assertion to the contrary. Kammerud Decl.  
16  
17 ¶ 2.<sup>4</sup> T-Mobile's continued failure to provide relevant information continues to prejudice to  
18  
19 Huawei, and Huawei asks that the Court compel T-Mobile to supplement its responses to  
20  
21 Interrogatory Nos. 1-8.  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26

---

27  
28 <sup>4</sup> Interrogatory No. 7 seeks identification of each person involved in T-Mobile's decision to stop,  
29 suspend, or otherwise change its handset supply relationship with Huawei. T-Mobile's response  
30 fails to identify a single individual involved in this decision. *See* Kammerud Decl. Ex. 6 at 18  
31 ("Those at T-Mobile 'involved' in the decision included Senior Management in consultation with  
32 Legal, along with Product Marketing, Procurement and Supply Chain.").

33  
34 Huawei sought identification of those involved to inform its selection of witnesses for  
35 deposition. Huawei did include the subject as one of its 30(b)(6) topics, for which T-Mobile  
36 originally designated Jason Young. During her deposition, T-Mobile witness Kathy Barnes  
37 identified Jason Young as having been responsible for the decision to terminate the supply  
38 relationship. Since that deposition, however, T-Mobile de-designated Jason Young on the  
39 related topic. Huawei noticed Mr. Young's deposition, in his individual capacity, on May 9, to  
40 explore these issues, but TMO refuses to produce Mr. Young for deposition because Huawei has  
41 served notices for eleven depositions (6 of T-Mobile and 5 of third parties or former T-Mobile  
42 employees). This includes the Letters of Request for OptoFidelity. If the Finnish judicial  
43 authorities respond to the Court's discovery request and a deposition is scheduled, Huawei will  
44 seek leave from this Court, if necessary, to take a deposition over the presumptive limit of ten.  
45

1                   **C.       T-Mobile Cannot Continue to Withhold Highly Relevant Documents<sup>5</sup>**

2  
3                   **Request for Production Nos. 1, 3, and 15.** T-Mobile's productions remain deficient  
4  
5 with respect to Request for Production Nos. 1, 3, and 15,<sup>6</sup> which request documents that identify  
6  
7 and describe T-Mobile's alleged trade secrets. Weeks ago Huawei's experts identified a cache of  
8  
9 technical documentation on T-Mobile's source code computer falling within the scope of these  
10  
11 requests. T-Mobile's documents and its Rule 30(b)(6) witness on the robot confirmed that this  
12  
13 set of materials comprises a core collection of documentation maintained as part of the  
14  
15 development and continued refinement of the robot at the center of this litigation. Huawei  
16  
17 demanded these materials be produced sufficiently in advance of its deposition of T-Mobile's  
18  
19 30(b)(6) witnesses. T-Mobile failed to do so. Huawei requests that those materials be produced.

20  
21                   **Request for Production Nos. 82, 83, and 89.** T-Mobile's productions remain deficient  
22  
23 with respect to Request for Production Nos. 82, 83, and 89,<sup>7</sup> which request documents reflecting  
24  
25

---

26  
27 <sup>5</sup> Today, T-Mobile made a production of another 12,500 pages of documents, which Huawei has  
28 not been able to review prior to filing this Motion. As today is the last day to file a Motion to  
29 Compel, Huawei cannot review these new materials prior to filing.

30  
31 <sup>6</sup> Request for Production No. 1: Any and all documents that identify or describe the alleged trade  
32 secrets that you contend Huawei misappropriated.

33 Request for Production No. 3: For each trade secret allegedly misappropriated by Huawei, a. any  
34 and all documents relating to the development of that trade secret . . . .

35 Request for Production No. 15: Any and all documents relating to the purchasing or  
36 manufacturing of each component of T-Mobile's Testing Robot, including the end effector,  
37 conductive tip, and robot arm.

38  
39 <sup>7</sup> Request for Production No. 82: All documents and communications reflecting each  
40 modification proposed and each modification made to T-Mobile's Testing Robot, including  
41 logbooks, from the time Huawei USA was given access to the lab for testing in September 2012  
42 through the date of these requests.

43 Request for Production No. 83: All documents and communications reflecting the instructions,  
44 guidance, and/or training made available to T-Mobile's handset supplier(s) and relating to T-  
45 Mobile's Testing Robot, the "computer" to which it "is hooked up to," and the "operating

1 modifications to T-Mobile's Testing Robot, including change logs to the hardware and software  
2 components thereof. T-Mobile has broadly identified its trade secrets as comprising such  
3 changes made prior to or during Huawei's access in 2012-2013. Kammerud Decl., Ex. 7. And  
4 its recently served expert reports specifically identify those changes as the foundation of its  
5 misappropriation claim. Moreover, any changes made after Huawei's access was revoked are  
6 relevant to show the value (or lack thereof) of the version of the Testing Robot that Huawei had  
7 access to and, thus, could have misappropriated. In depositions conducted this week, T-Mobile's  
8 Rule 30(b)(6) witnesses confirmed that at least some such records exist, including software  
9 change logs that are maintained in T-Mobile's source code repository system. T-Mobile's  
10 witnesses further confirmed that a review of the Perforce logs would be *necessary* to determine  
11 the date of specific software changes. A complete production in response to these requests is  
12 thus necessary for Huawei to rebut T-Mobile's claims.

13  
14  
15 **Request for Production Nos. 92 and 93.** T-Mobile's productions remain deficient with  
16 respect to Request for Production Nos. 92 and 93,<sup>8</sup> which request documents and  
17 communications related to third-parties OptoFidelity and Perfecto Mobile, both of which

18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33 software" referenced, *inter alia*, in paragraphs 9 and 33 of the Complaint, as those objects were  
34 made available to Huawei USA at the time Huawei USA was given access to the lab for testing  
35 (e.g., September 2012-May 2013) and as those objects exist as of the date of these requests.  
36 Request for Production No. 89: A copy of any change log or other documentation that reflects  
37 changes made to the software (including the source code and object code) used to operate T-  
38 Mobile's Testing Robot for the period of September 1, 2012, through September 2, 2014.

39  
40 <sup>8</sup> Request for Production No. 92: All documents and communications relating to OptoFidelity  
41 regarding T-Mobile's Testing Robot or machines used for touchscreen testing or reliability  
42 testing of mobile telephones.

43 Request for Production No. 93: All documents and communications relating to Perfecto Mobile  
44 regarding T-Mobile's Testing Robot or machines used for touchscreen testing or reliability  
45 testing of mobile telephones.



1 manufacture mobile phone testing systems. Huawei has consistently argued that these materials  
2 are relevant to the scope and legitimacy of T-Mobile's claimed trade secrets. This Court has  
3 agreed. *See* Dkt. No. 107. These materials are also relevant to damages. T-Mobile purchased a  
4 Perfecto Mobile system during the case period for the purpose of testing its mobile phones; the  
5 technical and financial details of that system provide a benchmark to the potential damages in  
6 this case. In addition, T-Mobile's experts rely on discussions with OptoFidelity in support of T-  
7 Mobile's trade secret claims and damages calculations, documentation of which has not been  
8 produced. T-Mobile must produce this material in order for Huawei to be able to fully rebut its  
9 experts' positions.

10  
11 In addition to the specific discovery requests enumerated above, during depositions of T-  
12 Mobile witnesses, it has become clear that there are additional documents that need to be  
13 produced. For example, on May 12, 2016, Huawei learned that important lab notebooks of  
14 David Jenkinson—TMO's lead engineer for the robot tester development project and also an  
15 inventor of T-Mobile's patents that cover the robot tester—have not been produced. Huawei will  
16 attempt to resolve these issues with T-Mobile but feels it necessary to mention this category of  
17 additional discovery in the event it becomes necessary to raise it with the Court in the future.

18  
19 **D. T-Mobile Must Supply Documentation Supporting Assertions Made with**  
20 **Respect to the Inspection T-Mobile Permitted of Its Lab**

21 In its September 4, 2015 requests, Huawei requested an inspection of T-Mobile's lab, the  
22 robot, and the testing and other operations performed with that robot (1) as they would have  
23 existed at the time Huawei had access to the lab and (2) as they existed at the time of the  
24 inspection. Kammerud Decl., Ex. 8. During meet and confers following those requests, T-  
25 Mobile refused the former (1) and offered only the latter (2). *Id.*, Ex. 9 at 3. Given its

1 preservation obligations, T-Mobile should have had little difficulty providing for inspection the  
2 exact trade secrets it claims were misappropriated. Nevertheless, when Huawei conducted its  
3 inspection of T-Mobile's labs and robot on May 2, 2016, T-Mobile only provided Huawei with  
4 access to the current robot and its operations. Before and during the inspection, Huawei  
5 requested change logs showing the precise changes or modifications made between the dates of  
6 Huawei's access in 2012-13 and the date of the inspection. T-Mobile did not provide such a list  
7 during the inspection and its Rule 30(b)(6) witness was unable to provide that information in his  
8 deposition. T-Mobile cannot refuse to produce the trade secrets it claims were misappropriated.  
9 Either T-Mobile needs to produce the robot and its operations as they existed at the time of the  
10 alleged misappropriation or a comprehensive set of change logs and documentation showing  
11 each modification made to the hardware and software of the robot since May 2013.  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22

### 23 **E. Reservation of Rights to Re-Open Depositions**

24 The documents and information being sought in this Motion, along with the additional  
25 productions of documents that T-Mobile has suggested are forthcoming (some of which are the  
26 subject of the Court's recent Order compelling discovery), cover materials that are highly  
27 relevant to depositions that have been conducted and topics which Huawei should not be  
28 foreclosed from exploring during depositions. To the extent T-Mobile's productions implicate  
29 depositions that have otherwise been completed, Huawei requests that it be permitted to re-open  
30 the depositions of the affected witnesses for a total of 10 hours at T-Mobile's expense.  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38

### 39 **III. CONCLUSION**

40 For the foregoing reasons, the Court should grant Huawei's Motion to Compel T-Mobile  
41 (a) to designate witnesses on 30(b)(6) Topic Nos. 21, 22, 25, and 30, (b) to provide a substantive  
42  
43  
44  
45

1 response to Interrogatory Nos. 9-11, (c) to supplement responses to Interrogatory Nos. 1-8, and  
2  
3 (d) to produce documents responsive to Request for Production Nos. 1, 3, 15, 82, 83, 89, 92, and  
4  
5 93.  
6

7  
8  
9 DATED this 13th day of May, 2016.  
10

11 **GORDON TILDEN THOMAS & CORDELL LLP**  
12 Attorneys for Defendant Huawei Device USA, Inc.  
13

14 By s/Franklin D. Cordell  
15

16 Franklin D. Cordell, WSBA #26392  
17 Jeffrey M. Thomas, WSBA #21175  
18 1001 Fourth Avenue, Suite 4000  
19 Seattle, Washington 98154  
20 Telephone: (206) 467-6477  
21 Facsimile: (206) 467-6292  
22 Email: [fcordell@gordontilden.com](mailto:fcordell@gordontilden.com)  
23 Email: [jthomas@gordontilden.com](mailto:jthomas@gordontilden.com)  
24

25 **STEPTOE & JOHNSON LLP**

26 Attorneys for Defendant Huawei Device USA, Inc.  
27

28 By s/Timothy C. Bickham  
29

30 William F. Abrams\*  
31 James F. Hibey\*  
32 Timothy C. Bickham\*  
33 Jessica I. Rothschild\*  
34 1330 Connecticut Avenue NW  
35 Washington, DC 20036  
36 Telephone: (202) 429-3000  
37 Facsimile: (202) 429-3902  
38 Email: [jhibey@steptoe.com](mailto:jhibey@steptoe.com)  
39 Email: [wabrams@steptoe.com](mailto:wabrams@steptoe.com)  
40 Email: [tbickham@steptoe.com](mailto:tbickham@steptoe.com)  
41 Email: [jrothschild@steptoe.com](mailto:jrothschild@steptoe.com)  
42

43 \* *Admitted Pro Hac Vice*  
44  
45

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45

**CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

I hereby certify that on May 13, 2016, I electronically filed the foregoing with the Clerk of the Court using the CM/ECF system, which will send notification of such filing to the following:

Michael E. Kipling  
Marjorie A. Walter  
KIPLING LAW GROUP PLLC  
4464 Fremont Avenue N., Suite 300  
Seattle, WA 98103  
kipling@kiplinglawgroup.com  
walter@kiplinglawgroup.com

John Hueston  
Alison Plessman  
Eric Hayden  
HUESTON HENNIGAN LLP  
523 West 6th Street  
Los Angeles, CA 90014  
jhueston@hueston.com  
aplessman@hueston.com  
ehayden@hueston.com

s/ Michael Flynn-O'Brien

Michael Flynn-O'Brien\*

\* admitted *pro hac vice*

DEFENDANT HUAWEI DEVICE USA, INC.  
AND HUAWEI TECHNOLOGIES CO., LTD.'S  
MOTION TO COMPEL - 11  
No. C14-1351 RAJ

**GORDON TILDEN THOMAS & CORDELL LLP**  
1001 Fourth Avenue, Suite 4000  
Seattle, WA 98154  
Phone (206) 467-6477  
Fax (206) 467-6292